

On the Origin of the Enhancement
of CP-violating Charge Asymmetries in $K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi$
Decays
Predicted from Chiral Theory

A.A.Bel'kov¹, G.Bohm², D.Ebert³, A.V.Lanyov¹, A.Schaale²

¹ Particle Physics Laboratory, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research,
Head Post Office, P.O.Box 79, 101000 Moscow, Russia

² DESY-Institute for High Energy Physics, Platanenallee 6, O-1615 Zeuthen, Germany

³ Institut für Elementarteilchenphysik, Humboldt-Universität,
Invalidenstraße 110, O-1040 Berlin, Germany

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We present an analysis of the enhancement of CP-violating charge asymmetries in $K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays. Calculations of decay amplitudes are performed on the basis of bosonized strong and weak Lagrangians derived from QCD-motivated quark Lagrangians. We show that the interplay of fourth-order contributions of chiral Lagrangians for strong interactions and penguin operators in weak interactions significantly enhances the charge asymmetries.

Contributed paper to XXVI International Conference on High Energy
Physics, Dallas, Texas, August 6, 1992.

Recently, much interest is devoted to the question of a possible enhancement of direct CP-violation effects in $K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays first proposed in [1]. In this paper from chiral Lagrangians with fourth-order derivative terms, including meson loop rescattering effects, the CP-violating charge asymmetry of the Dalitz plot slope parameter, $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$, was estimated to be of the order of 10^{-3} . On the other hand, in several recent papers [2, 3, 4, 5] estimates have been given which are 1-2 orders of magnitude smaller. By this reason and due to the fact that this problem is surely of great importance for the choice of the future experimental program at ϕ - and K -factories we have reanalyzed this question within our approach taking into account additional effects. First we will give the main definitions and assumptions used, next display all parameters entering the calculation and then show step by step the effects of including various refinements: fourth-order derivative terms, additional fourth-order s -quark mass terms, (π^0, η, η') -mixing, one-loop corrections connected to meson rescattering and electromagnetic penguins. In this way we hope to demonstrate more completely the mechanisms of enhancement for the effects of direct CP-violation in $K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays. For simplicity, we will consider only the above mentioned charge asymmetry of the slope parameter

$$\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi) = \frac{g(K^+) - g(K^-)}{g(K^+) + g(K^-)}.$$

The enhancement effects for other asymmetries, e.g. of branching ratios, are of the same origin.

The starting point of the following estimates is the effective Lagrangian describing nonleptonic weak interactions with strangeness change $|\Delta S| = 1$ which is given on the quark level by [6, 7, 8]:

$$\mathcal{L}_w^{nl} = \tilde{G} \sum_{i=1}^8 c_i \mathcal{O}_i. \quad (1)$$

Here $\tilde{G} = \sqrt{2} G_F \sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C$ is the weak coupling constant; c_i are Wilson coefficient functions which may be calculated in the QCD leading-log approximation, depending then explicitly on the renormalization scale μ . $\mathcal{O}_i$ are the four-quark operators consisting of products of left- and/or right-handed quark currents:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 &= \bar{u}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L - \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu s_L, \\ \mathcal{O}_2 &= \bar{u}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + 2\bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu d_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + 2\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu s_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L, \\ \mathcal{O}_3 &= \bar{u}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + 2\bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu d_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L - 3\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu s_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L, \\ \mathcal{O}_4 &= \bar{u}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L + \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu s_L - \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu d_L \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu s_L, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_5 &= \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu \lambda_c^a s_L \left(\sum_{q=u,d,s} \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu \lambda_c^a q_R \right), \quad \mathcal{O}_6 = \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu s_L \left(\sum_{q=u,d,s} \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu q_R \right), \\
\mathcal{O}_7 &= \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu s_L \left(\sum_{q=u,d,s} \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu Q q_R \right), \quad \mathcal{O}_8 = \bar{d}_L \gamma_\mu \lambda_c^a s_L \left(\sum_{q=u,d,s} \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu \lambda_c^a Q q_R \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $q_{L,R} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)q$; λ_c^a are the generators of the $SU(N_c)$ color group; Q is the matrix of electric quark charges. The operators $\mathcal{O}_{5,6}$ containing right-handed currents are generated by gluonic penguin diagrams and the analogous operators $\mathcal{O}_{7,8}$ arise from electromagnetic penguin diagrams.

The bosonized version of the effective Lagrangian (1) can be expressed in the form [9]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{eff}^{nl} &= \tilde{G} \left\{ (-\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3) \left[(J_{L\mu}^1 - iJ_{L\mu}^2)(J_{L\mu}^4 + iJ_{L\mu}^5) - (J_{L\mu}^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_{L\mu}^8)(J_{L\mu}^6 + iJ_{L\mu}^7) \right] \right. \\
&\quad + (\xi_1 + 5\xi_2) \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} J_{L\mu}^0 (J_{L\mu}^6 + iJ_{L\mu}^7) + \frac{10}{\sqrt{3}} \xi_3 J_{L\mu}^8 (J_{L\mu}^6 + iJ_{L\mu}^7) \\
&\quad + \xi_4 \left[(J_{L\mu}^1 - iJ_{L\mu}^2)(J_{L\mu}^4 + iJ_{L\mu}^5) + 2J_{L\mu}^3 (J_{L\mu}^6 + iJ_{L\mu}^7) \right] \\
&\quad - 4\xi_5 \left[(J_R^1 - iJ_R^2)(J_L^4 + iJ_L^5) - (J_R^3 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_R^8 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}J_R^0)(J_L^6 + iJ_L^7) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(J_R^6 + iJ_R^7)(\sqrt{2}J_L^8 - J_L^0) \right] \right. \\
&\quad + \xi_6 \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} (J_{L\mu}^4 + iJ_{L\mu}^5) J_R^0 + 6\xi_7 (J_{L\mu}^6 + iJ_{L\mu}^7)(J_{R\mu}^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_{R\mu}^8) \\
&\quad - 16\xi_8 \left[(J_R^1 - iJ_R^2)(J_L^4 + iJ_L^5) + \frac{1}{2}(J_R^3 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_R^8 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}J_R^0)(J_L^6 + iJ_L^7) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(J_R^6 + iJ_R^7)(\sqrt{2}J_L^8 - J_L^0) \right] \right\} + \text{h.c.} .
\end{aligned}$$

Here $J_{L/R\mu}^a$ and $J_{L/R}^a$ are bosonized $(V \mp A)$ and $(S \mp P)$ meson currents corresponding to the quark currents $\bar{q}\gamma_\mu \frac{1}{4}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\lambda^a q$ and $\bar{q}\frac{1}{4}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\lambda^a q$, respectively (λ^a are the generators of the $U(3)_F$ flavor group);

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_1 &= c_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_c} \right), \quad \xi_{2,3,4} = c_{2,3,4} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right), \\
\xi_{5,8} &= c_{5,8} + \frac{1}{2N_c} c_{6,7}, \quad \xi_{6,7} = c_{6,7} - \frac{2}{N_c} c_{5,8},
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the color factor $1/N_c$ originates from the Fierz-transformed contribution to the nonleptonic weak effective chiral Lagrangian [9].

The meson currents can be derived from the p^2 - and p^4 -terms of the quark determinant in a QCD-motivated chiral quark model using the bosonization

procedure described in [9]:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{L\mu}^{a(p^2)} &= i \frac{F_0^2}{8} \text{tr} \left[\lambda^a \partial_\mu U U^+ (1 + \frac{1}{2m^2} \mathcal{M}) \right] + \text{h.c.}, \\
J_L^{a(p^2)} &= \frac{F_0^2}{4} m R \text{tr} (\lambda^a U^+) + \frac{F_0^2}{8m} \text{tr} \left[\lambda^a (\partial^2 U^+ + 2 U^+ \mathcal{M}) \right], \\
J_{L\mu}^{a(p^4)} &= \frac{i N_c}{64\pi^2} \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda^a \left[\frac{1}{3} \partial_\nu U \partial_\mu U^+ \partial^\nu U U^+ + \{ \mathcal{M}, \partial_\mu U \} U^+ \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{6m^2} \left(\{ \partial_\mu \partial^2 U, \mathcal{M} \} U^+ - [\partial_\mu \partial_\nu U \partial^\nu U^+, \mathcal{M}] + \partial_\nu U \{ \partial_\mu \partial_\nu U^+, \mathcal{M} \} \right) \right] \right\} + \text{h.c.}, \\
J_L^{a(p^4)} &= -\frac{N_c}{192\pi^2 m} \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda^a \left[3 \left(-m^2 (U^+ \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^+ + \partial_\mu U^+ \partial^\mu U U^+) + \{ \partial^2 U^+, \mathcal{M} \} \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(U^+ (\{ \mathcal{M}, \partial_\mu U^+ \partial^\mu U \} + \partial_\mu U^+ \mathcal{M} \partial^\mu U) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. + (\{ \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^+, \mathcal{M} \} + \partial_\mu U \mathcal{M} \partial^\mu U^+) U^+ \right) \right] \right\}. \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Here $U = \Omega^2$, $\Omega = \exp \left\{ \frac{i\Phi}{\sqrt{2}F_0} \right\}$, where $\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\varphi_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{a=1}^8 \lambda_a \varphi_a$ is the matrix of pseudo- scalar meson fields φ_a . F_0 is the (bare) decay constant of the $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ decay. The terms containing the matrix $\mathcal{M} = 2m \Omega m_0 \Omega^+$, m being the average constituent quark mass and $m_0 = \text{diag}(m_u^0, m_d^0, m_s^0)$ is the mass matrix of current quarks, take into account the additional contributions from the quark mass expansion which are dominated by s -quark mass terms. The contributions of the gluon and electromagnetic penguin operators are determined by the parameter

$$R = \frac{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle}{m F_0^2}$$

where $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ is the quark condensate.

The corresponding contributions to the p^2 - and p^4 -parts of the effective Lagrangian of strong interaction are [9, 10]¹

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{(p^2)} &= \frac{F_0^2}{4} \text{tr} (\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^+) + \frac{F_0^2}{4} \text{tr} \left[M \left(1 + \frac{F_0^2}{2m \langle \bar{q}q \rangle} \partial^2 \right) U + \text{h.c.} \right], \\
\mathcal{L}^{(p^4)} &= \frac{N_c}{32\pi^2} \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{6} (\partial_\mu U \partial_\nu U^+)^2 - \frac{m F_0^2}{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle} \left(1 - \frac{4\pi^2 F_0^2}{m^2 N_c} \right) \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^+ (M U + U^+ M) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \text{diag}(\chi_u^2, \chi_d^2, \chi_s^2)$, $\chi_i^2 = -2m_i^0 F_0^{-2} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle$.

The parameters χ_i^2 , m_i^0 and m have been fixed in [9] by the spectrum of pseudoscalar and vector mesons. Here we use the value $m = 380$ MeV and the relation $m_s^0 = \hat{m}_0 \chi_s^2 / m_\pi^2$ where $\hat{m}_0 \equiv (m_u^0 + m_d^0)/2 \approx 5$ MeV and $\chi_u^2 =$

¹The notation $p^2(p^4)$ -terms refers to $p^2(p^4)$ -order in the corresponding momentum expansion of the quark determinant including terms with additional mass dimensions from $\mathcal{M}$.

0.0114 GeV^2 , $\chi_d^2 = 0.025 \text{ GeV}^2$, $\chi_s^2 = 0.47 \text{ GeV}^2$. Taking into account the additional Goldberger-Treiman contribution to $F_{K,\pi}$ arising from current quark mass splitting the value $F_0 = 89 \text{ MeV}$ was obtained in [9].²

The experimental status of the first p^4 -order term of the strong Lagrangians (4) was discussed in [11, 12] on the basis of the analysis of data on d -wave $\pi\pi$ -scattering and the decay width of $\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi$. In the present work we again will drop tachyonic contributions to both the strong Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^{(p^4)}$ and the bosonized currents $J_{L\mu}^{a(p^4)}$ and $J_L^{a(p^4)}$.

Using isospin relations, the $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ and $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decay amplitudes can be parametrized as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0} &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} A_2, \\ T_{K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-} &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} A_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} A_2, \quad T_{K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} A_0 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} A_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-} &= 2(\mathcal{A}_{11} + \mathcal{A}_{13}) - Y(\mathcal{B}_{11} + \mathcal{B}_{13} - \mathcal{B}_{23}) + O(Y^2), \\ T_{K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^+} &= (\mathcal{A}_{11} + \mathcal{A}_{13}) + Y(\mathcal{B}_{11} + \mathcal{B}_{13} + \mathcal{B}_{23}) + O(Y^2), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $Y = (s_3 - s_0)/m_\pi^2$ is the Dalitz variable and $s_i = (k - p_i)^2$, $s_0 = m_K^2/3 + m_\pi^2$; k, p_i are four-momenta of the kaon and i th pion ($i = 3$ belongs to the odd pion). The Dalitz-plot distribution can be written as a power series expansion of the amplitude squared, $|T|^2$, in terms of the corresponding kinematical variables Y and X

$$|T|^2 \propto 1 + gY + hY^2 + kX^2 + \dots \quad (7)$$

where $X = (s_2 - s_1)/m_\pi^2$; g, h and k are the slope parameters.

The isotopic amplitudes $A_{2,0}$ determine the $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ transitions into states with isospin $I = 2, 0$, respectively:

$$A_2 = a_2 e^{i\delta_2}, \quad A_0 = a_0 e^{i\delta_0}$$

where $\delta_{2,0}$ are the phases of $\pi\pi$ -scattering. It is well known, that direct CP-violation results in an additional (small) relative phase between a_2 and a_0 .

The isotopic amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}, \mathcal{B}_{IJ}$ of $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays have two indices: I , the isospin of the final state, and J , the doubled value of isospin change between the initial and final states. It is customary also for the 3π -system to introduce

² Note the appearance of the important new symmetry breaking term $\sim tr M \partial^2 U$ in (4) which contributes to $F_K - F_\pi$ splitting. This term plays the major role for the effect of direct CP-violation considered here.

strong phase shifts α_1 , β_1 and β_2 corresponding to the relevant isospin states $I = 1_s$ (symmetric), $I = 1_m$ (mixed symmetric), $I = 2$ by writing [13]

$$\mathcal{A}_{11} + \mathcal{A}_{13} = (a_{11} + a_{13}) e^{i\alpha_1}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{11} + \mathcal{B}_{13} = (b_{11} + b_{13}) e^{i\beta_1}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{23} = b_{23} e^{i\beta_2}.$$

We shall use this representation here only in order to display more clearly the relationships between the main contributions to the direct CP-violation effect. Because the strong Hamiltonian is not necessarily diagonal with respect to the $I = 1_s, I = 1_m$ isospin states and, if isospin breaking is included, even $I = 1$ and $I = 2$ states get mixed, leading to the necessity of introducing more phases (cf [1]), the exact calculations of $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ have to be done using the complex quantities $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}$, $\mathcal{B}_{IJ}$ given below by (8) directly, without introducing the strong phases $\alpha_1, \beta_{1,2}$ explicitly.

Let us next introduce the contributions of the four-quark operators $\mathcal{O}_i$ to the isotopic amplitudes $A_I^{(i)}$, $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{IJ}^{(i)}$ by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= -i \sum_{i=1}^8 \xi_i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \tilde{G} F_0 (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) A_2^{(i)}, & A_0 &= -i \sum_{i=1}^8 \xi_i \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} \tilde{G} F_0 (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) A_0^{(i)}; \\ \mathcal{A}_{IJ} &= -\sum_{i=1}^8 \xi_i \left(\tilde{G} \frac{m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}{12} \right) \mathcal{A}_{IJ}^{(i)}, & \mathcal{B}_{IJ} &= -\sum_{i=1}^8 \xi_i \left(\tilde{G} \frac{m_\pi^2}{4} \right) \mathcal{B}_{IJ}^{(i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The parameter ε' of direct CP-violation in $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays and the charge asymmetry of the slope parameters $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ can be expressed by the formulae

$$\varepsilon' = -\frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im } a_0}{\text{Re } a_0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega} \frac{\text{Im } a_2}{\text{Im } a_0} \right) \exp[i(\pi/2 + \delta_2 - \delta_0)] \quad (9)$$

and

$$\Delta g \left(K^\pm \rightarrow \left\{ \frac{\pi^\pm \pi^\pm \pi^\mp}{\pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^\pm} \right\} \right) = \frac{\text{Im } F_1 \sin(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) \mp \text{Im } F_2 \sin(\alpha_1 - \beta_2)}{\text{Re } F_1 \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) \mp \text{Re } F_2 \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_2)} \quad (10)$$

where $\omega = \text{Re } a_2 / \text{Re } a_0$; $F_1 = (a_{11}^* + a_{13}^*)(b_{11} + b_{13})$, $F_2 = (a_{11}^* + a_{13}^*)b_{23}$.³

Using only the currents $J_{L\mu}^{a(p^2)}$, $J_L^{a(p^2)}$ and the p^2 -order part of the strong Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^{(p^2)}$ it is possible to reproduce the following relations between $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ isotopic amplitudes in the spirit of the “soft pion” limit:

$$\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(i)} = \mathcal{B}_{11}^{(i)} = A_0^{(i)}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{13}^{(i)} = A_2^{(i)} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, 6), \quad (11)$$

where for nonvanishing amplitudes we have

$$A_0^{(1)} = -A_0^{(2,3)} = -1 = -A_2^{(4)}, \quad A_0^{(5)} = 4R. \quad (12)$$

³In deriving charge asymmetries, one has to keep in mind, that charge conjugation does reverse the phases of ξ_i but not those $A_I^{(i)}$, $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}^{(i)}$, $\mathcal{B}_{IJ}^{(i)}$.

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(7)} &= -\frac{1}{5}\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(7)} = A_0^{(7)} = -A_2^{(7)} = 2; \\
\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(8)} &= -4A_0^{(8)} = 3\mathcal{A}_{13}^{(8)} = -32R(2m^2R - m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \\
A_2^{(8)} &= 8R(m^2R - m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2); \\
\mathcal{B}_{13}^{(4)} &= -\frac{1}{4}(5m_K^2 - 14m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \quad \mathcal{B}_{13}^{(7)} = -\frac{1}{2}(7m_K^2 + 2m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \\
\mathcal{B}_{13}^{(8)} &= -2R(9m^2R - 8m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2); \\
\mathcal{B}_{23}^{(4)} &= \frac{9}{4}(3m_K^2 - 2m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \quad \mathcal{B}_{23}^{(7)} = \frac{9}{2}(m_K^2 - 2m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \\
\mathcal{B}_{23}^{(8)} &= -18R(m^2R - m_\pi^2)/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2).
\end{aligned}$$

(the other isotopic amplitudes vanish).

As the first step, let us consider only the contributions due to the operators $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_6$, neglecting the electromagnetic penguin operators $\mathcal{O}_{7,8}$. It is convenient to present the terms in the numerator of the right-hand side of eq.(10) for $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ in a more visual form

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Im } F_1 &= \Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)} + \Delta^{(1/2, 3/2)}, \\
\Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)} &= \text{Re } a_{11} \text{Im } b_{11} - \text{Im } a_{11} \text{Re } b_{11}, \quad \Delta^{(1/2, 3/2)} = \text{Re } a_{13} \text{Im } b_{11} - \text{Im } a_{11} \text{Re } b_{13}; \\
\text{Im } F_2 &= -\text{Im } a_{11} \text{Re } b_{23} \equiv \Delta'^{(1/2, 3/2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)}$ describes the contribution of the interference of isotopic amplitudes a_{11} and b_{11} for transitions with $\Delta I = 1/2$, and $\Delta^{(1/2, 3/2)}, \Delta'^{(1/2, 3/2)}$ are the contributions from interferences of amplitudes a_{IJ} and b_{IJ} with $\Delta I = 1/2$ and $3/2$. In writing eq.(13) we assume that direct CP-violation arises only due to the imaginary parts of the isotopic amplitudes with $\Delta I = 1/2$ generated by the imaginary part of the Wilson coefficient c_5 of the penguin operator $\mathcal{O}_5$. The contribution of the operator $\mathcal{O}_6$ is small and is therefore neglected. From (11) and (12) it is obvious that in the soft-pion limit valid for p^2 -order terms $\Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)} = 0$, and only interferences of amplitudes with $\Delta I = 1/2$ and $3/2$ can contribute to the charge asymmetry Δg in this limit.

It is well known that the fourth-order terms of the chiral Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^{(p^4)}$ (4) and their contributions to the currents $J_{L\mu}^{a(p^4)}$ and $J_L^{a(p^4)}$ (3) lead to a modification of soft-pion relations for isotopic $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ and $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ amplitudes. This modification was already discussed in ref. [12]. In particular, the additional contributions due to the first term of $J_L^{a(p^4)}$ to $\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(i)}$ ($i=1, 2, 3, 5$) are:⁴

$$\Delta\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(1)} = -\Delta\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(2,3)} = -\frac{m_K^2 - 3m_\pi^2}{12F_0^2\pi^2}, \quad \Delta\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(5)} = -4R\frac{m_K^2 - 3m_\pi^2}{12F_0^2\pi^2};$$

⁴The p^4 -interactions do not contribute to $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays.

$$\Delta\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(1)} = -\Delta\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(2,3)} = \frac{m_K^2 + 3m_\pi^2}{12F_0^2\pi^2}, \quad \Delta\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(5)} = 4R \frac{m_K^2 + 3m_\pi^2}{12F_0^2\pi^2}. \quad (14)$$

One can see from (11) and (12) that the contribution of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^{(p^2)}$ and the corresponding currents $J_{L\mu}^{a(p^2)}$ and $J_L^{a(p^2)}$ to the amplitudes with $|\Delta I| = 1/2$ is proportional to $(-\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 + 4R\xi_5)$. At the same time the contribution associated to the corrections (14) is proportional to $(-\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 - 4R\xi_5)$. So, ξ_5 cannot be absorbed by a redefinition of the parameters ξ_i . Due to this reason it is possible to separate penguin and nonpenguin contributions in a data fit for $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ and $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays. This different behaviour between penguin and nonpenguin contributions, arising on the fourth-order level, leads to a nonzero value of the $\Delta^{(1/2,1/2)}$ term which, as will be shown below, becomes the main source of the enhancement of the CP-violating charge asymmetry of the slope parameters $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ discussed in this paper.

Besides p^4 -interactions, (π^0, η, η') -mixing and one-loop corrections corresponding to meson rescattering also modify the soft-pion relations for the isotopic $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ and $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ amplitudes. The results of lengthy symbolic calculations using the package of tools [14] based on the REDUCE system are shown in table 1. Even though the contributions of (π^0, η, η') -mixing are proportional to the small mass difference of d - and u -quarks (breaking of isotopic symmetry), they give a contribution of about 30% in the description of direct CP-violation in $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays due to the new additional contributions to $\text{Im } a_2$, $\text{Im } a_{13}$ and $\text{Im } a_{23}$ (via $|\Delta I| = 3/2$ transitions) arising from the penguin operator $\mathcal{O}_5$. The importance of one-loop corrections for a correct estimation of direct CP-violation is determined by both the phase shifts α_1, β_1 and β_2 , induced by $\pi\pi$ -interactions in final states, and the modification of the real parts of A_I , $\mathcal{A}_{IJ}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{IJ}$ due to $\pi\pi$ -, πK - and $\bar{K}K$ -scattering.

In our approach the meson loops were estimated using a special superpropagator regularization method [15] which is particularly well-suited for treating loops in nonlinear chiral theories. The result is equivalent to dimensional regularization, the difference being that the scale parameter μ is no longer free but fixed by the inherent scale of the chiral theory, namely $\mu = 4\pi F_0$, and UV divergences have to be replaced by a finite term through the substitution

$$(C-1/\varepsilon) \longrightarrow C_{SP} = 2C+1+\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{d}{dz} \left(\log \Gamma^{-2}(2z+2) \right) \right]_{z=0} = -1+4C \approx 1.309, \quad (15)$$

where $C = 0.577$ is the Euler constant and $\varepsilon = (4-D)/2$. At the low-energy scale $\mu = 4\pi F_0 \approx 1 \text{ GeV}$, the Wilson coefficients $c_i(\mu)$ get probably corrections $O(1/N_c, \mu)$ which cannot be calculated exactly until now. Therefore, in our approach the coefficients c_i , resp. ξ_i , have been treated as phenomenological

parameters determined by experiment from the simultaneous analysis of $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays [1, 12].

In order to separate the contributions belonging to the dominating combination $(-\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3)$ and to ξ_4 , ξ_5 respectively, we used again, as in [1, 12], the experimental data on parameters of $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays given in table 2: partial decay widths B_i and the expansion coefficients g_i , h_i of the matrix element squared with respect to the variable Y (see (7)). We obtained the following values of the parameters:

$$(-\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3) = 6.96 \pm 0.48, \quad \xi_4 = 0.516 \pm 0.025, \quad \xi_5 = -0.183 \pm 0.022. \quad (16)$$

Here we give the errors rescaled with χ^2 according to the standard procedure [16]. The values of B_i , g_i and h_i , corresponding to the parameter estimates given below are also presented in table 2. If we would consider C_{SP} as a free parameter, the fit fixes its value as $C_{SP} = 1.36 \pm 0.54$, in good agreement with the prescription (15).

The coefficients c_i written in (1) cannot be considered as well defined until a procedure for the bosonization of hadronic currents is given. The procedure used here differs from the original more heuristic one used in [1, 12] with respect to some normalization factors and Fierz-corrections. Therefore the numerical values found here cannot be compared directly to those in [1, 12], in spite of the fact that physical results should nevertheless not disagree, if in both case the c_i are fixed by the same experimental data.

As the analysis of the coefficients c_i in leading-log approximation of QCD has shown, the main contribution to direct CP-violation comes from the penguin diagrams. If we still neglect the contribution of electromagnetic penguin operators, the imaginary part of the coefficient c_5 , responsible for the direct CP-violation, can be calculated from the relation (9) as

$$|\text{Im } c_5|^{exp} = 0.053_{-0.011}^{+0.015} |\varepsilon'/\varepsilon|.$$

This leads to the following estimates for the charge asymmetries of the slope parameters

$$|\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \pi^\pm \pi^\mp)| = 0.23_{-0.08}^{+0.05} |\varepsilon'/\varepsilon|, \quad |\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^\pm)| = 0.19_{-0.08}^{+0.03} |\varepsilon'/\varepsilon|. \quad (17)$$

The difference of the first of these values with respect to the one given earlier [1, 12] (less than a factor 2) represents the model-dependence of this approach. The second value, $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^\pm)$, is further diminished by the effect of (π^0, η, η') -mixing, formerly not taken into account in this channel. For a final

judgement on the predicted Δg -values, one should also, however, take into account the effect of electromagnetic penguins (see below).

For a comparison of our results with those of [2], we have to put that estimate into a form comparable to (17), resulting in $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi) \approx 0.03 |\varepsilon'/\varepsilon|$. The very small numerical value of $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ given in [2] is partly due to the small estimate taken for $|\varepsilon'/\varepsilon|$, based on calculations of Wilson coefficients using the leading-log approximation of QCD. This estimate is one order of magnitude smaller than the experimental value used in our papers. Clearly, this means that we should indeed explain only the difference of just one order of magnitude. The enhancement of the charge asymmetry of the slope parameter $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ of about one order of magnitude, compared with the soft-pion limit estimation, is caused by the contribution connected with $\Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)}$ originating from the different behavior of penguin and non-penguin isotopic amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_{11}^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{11}^{(i)}$. This difference arises due to fourth-order corrections, (π^0, η, η') -mixing and one-loop corrections which are included in table 1. The contribution from $\Delta^{(1/2, 1/2)}$ increases the value of $\text{Im } F_1$ by a factor of 19 (see table 1d) in comparison to the value of the soft-pion limit (see table 1a). On the other hand, one-loop corrections significantly decrease the value of $\text{Im } F_2$ due to suppression of $\mathcal{B}_{23}$. But as a result of both contributions the numerator of the formula (10) significantly increases in comparison with its denominator (see values of $\text{Re } F_{1,2}$ in table 1). So, the additional enhancement of $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ can be traced back to an interplay of higher-order derivative terms, meson rescattering and (π^0, η, η') -mixing. In particular, the influence of p^4 -contributions proved to be decisive. It seems impossible to us to analyze this question without detailed calculations including all the above mentioned corrections (the p^4 -corrections have been considered only approximately by [2], but the one-loop corrections for $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays have not been calculated in ref. [2, 3, 4, 5] at all).

It is worth noting that the corrections to the soft-pion amplitudes of $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays, discussed here, essentially modify also the well-known Li-Wolfenstein relation [17] which connects the direct CP -violation parameters of $K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ and $K_L^0 \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays:

$$\varepsilon'_{+-0} = -2\varepsilon'.$$

As it was discussed in papers [18, 19, 12] the p^4 -contributions, (π^0, η, η') -mixing and one-loop corrections can essentially enhance the direct CP -violation effects in the decays $K^0(\bar{K}^0) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ as compared with $K^0 \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays and the ratio $|\varepsilon'_{+-0}/\varepsilon'|$ might be larger than the Li-Wolfenstein prediction, which corresponds to the soft-pion limit of chiral theory. In our approach [12] we found $|\varepsilon'_{+-0}| \approx 6.8|\varepsilon'|$. Also here, as in the case of charged K decays, the different

behavior of mesonic matrix elements for penguin and nonpenguin operators at the level of p^4 -corrections plays a most important role. Thus, in the estimation of observable effects of direct CP-violation, their contributions have therefore to be separated explicitly in any order.⁵

Finally we tried to estimate the effect of electroweak penguin operators $\mathcal{O}_{7,8}$ on the charge asymmetry $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$. The contributions of $\mathcal{O}_7$ may be neglected in comparison to the dominating contributions of the operator $\mathcal{O}_8$ (see table 1). Furthermore, calculations of Wilson coefficients $c_{5,8}$ in leading-log approximation of QCD [20, 21] show, that $\text{Re } c_8 \ll \text{Re } c_5$, so the contributions of electroweak penguins to the absolute value of amplitudes for nonleptonic K -decays may be neglected as well. The most important effect of the electroweak penguin operator $\mathcal{O}_8$ appears in the parameters of direct CP-violation being discussed here. Because of the strong dependence of $\text{Im } c_8$ on the mass of the t -quark for $m_t \geq 100$ GeV on one hand, and the weak dependence of $\text{Im } c_5$ on m_t on the other hand, the contribution to direct CP-violation from electroweak penguin operators becomes important for large m_t . Using the dependence of the ratio $\eta(m_t) = \text{Im } c_8 / \text{Im } c_5$ on m_t , as derived in the papers [20, 21], we repeated the calculational procedure described above. As a result we found the phenomenological connection between $\Delta g(K^\pm \rightarrow 3\pi)$ and ε' shown in fig.1, which demonstrates that taking into account the electroweak penguin operator $\mathcal{O}_8$ does not only not suppress the effect of direct CP-violation in $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays, but may lead to an additional enhancement in comparison with that seen in $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ decays. Of course, this makes the experimental investigation of $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays with high statistics even more interesting.

Two of the authors (A.A.Belkov and A.V.Lanyov) are grateful for the hospitality extended to them at the DESY-Institute for High Energy Physics, Zeuthen.

References

- [1] A.A.Bel'kov, G.Bohm, D.Ebert and A.V.Lanyov, Phys. Lett. B232 (1989) 118.

⁵The description of $\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi$ decays represents the most striking example of the importance of higher-order corrections (see [11]). In the soft-pion limit the amplitudes of $\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi$ decays are different from zero only due to the contribution of chiral symmetry breaking. The corresponding total width $\Gamma_{\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi}^{(soft-pion)} = 4 \text{ keV}$ turns out to be much smaller than the experimental value $\Gamma_{\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi}^{(exp.)} = (189 \pm 32) \text{ keV}$. However, the p^4 -corrections strongly increase the total width up to the value $\Gamma_{\eta' \rightarrow \eta 2\pi}^{(p^4)} = 220 \text{ keV}$ which is in a good agreement with the experimental data.

- [2] H.-Y.Cheng, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 919.
- [3] G.D'Ambrosio, G.Isidori and N.Paver, Phys. Lett. B273 (1991) 497.
- [4] G.Isidori, L.Maiani and A.Pugliese, Preprint INFN n.848, Roma 1991.
- [5] E.Shabalin, Preprint ITEP 6-92, Moscow, 1992.
- [6] A.I.Vainshtein, V.I.Zakharov and M.A.Shifman, JETP 72 (1977) 1275;
M.A.Shifman, A.I.Vainshtein and V.I.Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B120 (1977) 316.
- [7] F.J.Gilman and M.B.Wise, Phys. Rev. D20 (1979) 2392.
- [8] J.Bijnens and M.B.Wise, Phys. Lett. B137 (1984) 245.
- [9] D.Ebert, A.A.Bel'kov, A.V.Lanyov and A.Schaale, Preprint PHE 91-08, Zeuthen, 1991.
- [10] D.Ebert and H.Reinhardt, Nucl. Phys. B271 (1986) 188;
- [11] A.A.Bel'kov and A.V.Lanyov, Yad. Fiz. 45 (1987) 496; 47 (1988) 516.
A.A.Bel'kov, D.Ebert and V.N.Pervushin, Phys. Lett. 193B (1987) 315.
A.A.Bel'kov, A.V.Lanyov and D.Ebert, Yad. Fiz. 50 (1989) 1093.
- [12] A.A.Bel'kov, D.Ebert and A.V.Lanyov, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 322.
A.A.Bel'kov, G.Bohm, D.Ebert, A.V.Lanyov and A.Schaale, Preprint PHE 91-06, Zeuthen, 1991 (to be published in Int.J.Mod.Phys.) .
- [13] T.J.Devlin and J.O.Dickey, Rev. Mod. Phys. 51 (1979) 237.
- [14] A.A.Bel'kov and A.V.Lanyov, JINR Communication E11-91-162, Dubna, 1991;
Proc. ISSAC'91, July 1991, Bonn, Germany, ed. S.M.Watt, ACM Press, 1991, p.454.
- [15] M.K.Volkov, Yad. Fiz. 6 (1967) 1100; 7 (1968) 445; Ann. of Phys. (N.Y.) 49 (1968) 202; Fortschr. Phys. 28 (1974) 499.
- [16] Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. B239 (1990) 1.
- [17] L.F.Li and L.Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D36 (1980) 178.
- [18] J.F.Donoghue, B.R.Holstein and G.Valencia, Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 789.
- [19] S.Fajfer and J.-M.Gerard, Z. Phys. C42 (1989) 425.

- [20] G.Buchalla, A.J.Buras and M.K.Harlander, Nucl. Phys. B337 (1990) 313.
- [21] E.A.Paschos and Y.L.Wu, Mod. Phys. Lett. A2 (1991) 93.

Figure Caption

Fig.1. Dependence of the asymmetry of the slope parameter Δg on the top quark mass.

Table 1. Isotopic amplitudes of $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays
under successive inclusion of various corrections

1a) Soft-pion limit

	$\mathcal{O}_1$	$\mathcal{O}_2$	$\mathcal{O}_3$	$\mathcal{O}_4$	$\mathcal{O}_5$	$\mathcal{O}_6$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_7$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_8$
Re A_0	-1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	-22.42	0.000	0.015	2.362
Re $\mathcal{A}_{11}$	-1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	-22.42	0.000	0.015	-9.343
Re $\mathcal{B}_{11}$	-1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	-22.42	0.000	-0.073	-0.903
Re A_2	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.00	0.000	-0.015	1.017
Re $\mathcal{A}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.00	0.000	-0.015	-4.471
Re $\mathcal{B}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	-1.068	0.00	0.000	-0.028	-2.891
Re $\mathcal{B}_{23}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	6.932	0.00	0.000	0.030	-2.289

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im } F_1 &= 1.19|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Im } F_2 &= -3.97|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Re } F_1 &= 114.5 \\ \text{Re } F_2 &= 40.2\end{aligned}$$

1b) Additional inclusion of p^4 -corrections

	$\mathcal{O}_1$	$\mathcal{O}_2$	$\mathcal{O}_3$	$\mathcal{O}_4$	$\mathcal{O}_5$	$\mathcal{O}_6$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_7$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_8$
Re A_0	-1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	-22.42	0.000	0.015	2.362
Re $\mathcal{A}_{11}$	-1.217	1.217	1.217	0.000	-19.22	0.000	0.018	-7.233
Re $\mathcal{B}_{11}$	-0.701	0.701	0.701	0.000	-30.45	0.000	-0.077	-0.623
Re A_2	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.00	0.000	-0.015	1.017
Re $\mathcal{A}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.217	0.00	0.000	-0.018	-3.757
Re $\mathcal{B}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.914	0.00	0.000	-0.030	-4.033
Re $\mathcal{B}_{23}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.386	0.00	0.000	0.024	-3.499

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im } F_1 &= 10.4|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Im } F_2 &= -3.88|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Re } F_1 &= 125.9 \\ \text{Re } F_2 &= 48.1\end{aligned}$$

1c) Additional inclusion of (π^0, η, η') -mixing

	$\mathcal{O}_1$	$\mathcal{O}_2$	$\mathcal{O}_3$	$\mathcal{O}_4$	$\mathcal{O}_5$	$\mathcal{O}_6$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_7$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_8$
Re A_0	-0.996	0.979	0.961	-0.010	-22.15	0.004	0.015	2.400
Re $\mathcal{A}_{11}$	-1.243	1.100	1.012	0.080	-19.82	0.036	0.017	-7.071
Re $\mathcal{B}_{11}$	-0.788	0.641	0.323	0.051	-30.61	0.037	-0.076	-0.583
Re A_2	-0.004	0.021	0.039	1.009	-0.27	-0.004	-0.015	0.980
Re $\mathcal{A}_{13}$	0.056	0.109	0.467	1.287	-1.22	-0.041	-0.021	-3.588
Re $\mathcal{B}_{13}$	0.069	0.123	0.512	-0.879	-0.52	-0.048	-0.033	-4.035
Re $\mathcal{B}_{23}$	-0.019	0.063	0.134	7.471	-0.67	-0.011	0.022	-3.462

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im } F_1 &= 9.8|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Im } F_2 &= -4.09|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Re } F_1 &= 131.7 \\ \text{Re } F_2 &= 52.6\end{aligned}$$

1d) Additional inclusion of one-loop corrections

	$\mathcal{O}_1$	$\mathcal{O}_2$	$\mathcal{O}_3$	$\mathcal{O}_4$	$\mathcal{O}_5$	$\mathcal{O}_6$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_7$	$\alpha\mathcal{O}_8$
Re A_0	-1.258	1.241	1.205	-0.010	-27.68	0.004	0.034	3.622
Re $\mathcal{A}_{11}$	-1.273	1.129	1.187	0.080	-17.47	0.076	-0.009	-8.084
Re $\mathcal{B}_{11}$	-0.441	0.293	0.565	0.051	-48.38	0.037	0.003	-8.091
Im A_0	-0.461	0.461	0.461	0.000	9.78	0.000	0.007	-0.506
Im $\mathcal{A}_{11}$	-0.087	0.087	0.087	0.000	-4.29	0.000	0.003	-1.167
Im $\mathcal{B}_{11}$	-1.104	1.104	1.104	0.000	-48.45	0.000	0.009	-7.063
Re A_2	-0.004	0.021	0.039	0.692	-0.27	-0.004	-0.013	0.485
Re $\mathcal{A}_{13}$	0.056	0.109	0.467	1.798	-1.22	-0.081	-0.041	-5.592
Re $\mathcal{B}_{13}$	0.069	0.123	0.506	-0.710	-0.52	-0.048	-0.038	-4.967
Re $\mathcal{B}_{23}$	-0.019	0.063	0.134	1.625	-0.68	-0.011	-0.007	-0.515
Im A_2	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.231	0.00	0.000	0.003	-0.231
Im $\mathcal{A}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.184	0.00	0.000	-0.003	-0.593
Im $\mathcal{B}_{13}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.956	0.00	0.000	-0.017	-3.444
Im $\mathcal{B}_{23}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	-1.018	0.00	0.000	-0.005	0.272

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Im } F_1 &= 22.6|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Im } F_2 &= -0.63|\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}| \\ \text{Re } F_1 &= 143.9 \\ \text{Re } F_2 &= 14.0\end{aligned}$$

Table 2. Experimental and theoretical values of the parameters
for $K \rightarrow 2\pi$, $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ decays

Parameter	Experiment [16]	Theory
B_{+0}	0.2117 ± 0.0015	0.2125
B_{+-}	0.6861 ± 0.0024	0.6965
B_{00}	0.3139 ± 0.0024	0.3130
B_{++-}	0.0559 ± 0.0005	0.0553
g_{++-}	-0.2162 ± 0.0031	-0.2144
h_{++-}	0.011 ± 0.005	0.016
B_{00+}	0.0173 ± 0.0004	0.0176
g_{00+}	0.594 ± 0.019	0.552
h_{00+}	0.035 ± 0.015	0.014
B_{+-0}	0.1238 ± 0.021	0.1182
g_{+-0}	0.670 ± 0.014	0.648
h_{+-0}	0.079 ± 0.007	0.151